

Moduli of bounded holomorphic functions in the ball

Boris Korenblum

State University of New York, Albany, New York 12222, U.S.A.

John E. McCarthy *

Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri 63130, U.S.A.

February 25 1993

Abstract

We prove that there is a continuous non-negative function g on the unit sphere in $\mathbb{C}^d$, $d \geq 2$, whose logarithm is integrable with respect to Lebesgue measure, and which vanishes at only one point, but such that no non-zero bounded analytic function m in the unit ball, with boundary values m^* , has $|m^*| \leq g$ almost everywhere. The proof analyzes the common range of co-analytic Toeplitz operators in the Hardy space of the ball.

0 Introduction

Let B_d be the unit ball in $\mathbb{C}^d$, S_d be the boundary of B_d , and σ_d be normalized Lebesgue measure on S_d . Every function m in $H^\infty(B_d)$, the space of bounded analytic functions in B_d , has radial limits σ_d -almost everywhere on S_d , defining a function m^* on the sphere; conversely, m can be recovered from m^* by integrating against the Szegő kernel. The problem which this paper addresses is when a given non-negative bounded function g on S_d is the modulus $|m^*|$ of some function m in $H^\infty(B_d)$.

When $d = 1$, the problem was completely solved by Szegő [10]: a necessary and sufficient condition that g be the modulus of a non-zero function in $H^\infty(B_1)$ is

$$\int_{S_d} \log(g) d\sigma_d > -\infty \tag{0.1}$$

*Partially supported by the National Science Foundation grant DMS 9296099

For $d > 1$, condition (0.1) is necessary and sufficient for g to be the modulus of a function in the larger Nevanlinna class $N(B_d)$, consisting of those holomorphic functions f on the ball for which

$$T(f, 1) := \sup_{0 < r < 1} \int_{S_d} \log^+ |f(r\zeta)| d\sigma_d(\zeta) < \infty$$

[8, Theorem 10.11]. It is no longer sufficient, however, for g to be the modulus of a bounded analytic function, because the function

$$\zeta \mapsto \text{ess} \sup_{-\pi \leq \theta \leq \pi} |m^*(e^{i\theta}\zeta)|$$

must be lower semi-continuous on S_d if m is in $H^\infty(B_d)$ [8]. In [8, Theorem 12.5], Rudin proves that if g is log-integrable, and there exists some non-zero f in $H^\infty(B_d)$ with $g \geq |f^*|$ a.e. and $g/|f^*|$ lower semi-continuous, then there does exist m in $H^\infty(B_d)$ with $g = |m^*|$ a.e.

The main result of this paper is the following:

Theorem 3.4 *Let $d \geq 2$. There is a non-negative continuous function g on S_d , with $\int_{S_d} \log(g) d\sigma_d > -\infty$, and which vanishes at only one point, but such that for no non-zero function m in $H^\infty(B_d)$ is $|m^*| \leq g$ almost everywhere $[\sigma_d]$.*

The proof involves the analysis of co-analytic Toeplitz operators. If μ is a compactly supported measure on $\mathbb{C}^d$, let $P^2(\mu)$ denote the closure of the polynomials in $L^2(\mu)$, and let P denote the orthogonal projection from $L^2(\mu)$ onto $P^2(\mu)$. If m is a bounded analytic function on the support of μ , the co-analytic Toeplitz operator $T_{\bar{m}}^{P^2(\mu)}$ is defined by

$$T_{\bar{m}}^{P^2(\mu)} f = P \bar{m} f.$$

When μ is σ_d , the space $P^2(\mu)$ is called the Hardy space $H^2(B_d)$.

The idea of the proof is as follows. A function f is in the range of the co-analytic Toeplitz operator $T_{\bar{m}}^{H^2(B_d)}$ if and only if the linear map

$$\Gamma : p \mapsto \langle p, f \rangle_{H^2(B_d)}$$

is bounded on $P^2(|m^*|^2 \sigma)$. So f is in the range of all co-analytic Toeplitz operators if and only if Γ is a continuous linear functional on

$$\cup_{m \in H^\infty(B_d)} P^2(|m^*|^2 \sigma_d). \quad (0.2)$$

The Smirnov class $N^+(B_d)$ consists of those functions f in $N(B_d)$ for which $\{\log^+ |f(r \cdot)| : 0 < r < 1\}$ is a uniformly integrable family on S_d . Equipped with the metric $\rho(f, g) =$

$\int_{S_d} \log(1 + |f - g|) d\sigma_d$, it becomes a topological vector space that is not locally convex. When $d = 1$, (0.2) coincides (as a set) with the Smirnov class. In [2] it was shown that the locally convex inductive limit topology on (0.2) was the Mackey topology of $(N^+(B_1), \rho)$, and so a function f is in the common range of all co-analytic Toeplitz operators in $H^2(B_1)$ if and only if it is in the dual of $(N^+(B_1), \rho)$; the dual has been characterized by Yanagihara as those functions for which $\hat{f}(n) = O(e^{-c\sqrt{n}})$ for some $c > 0$ [11] (see [3] for a simpler proof).

In [4], Nawrocki characterized the dual of $N^+(B_d)$ as those functions f whose Taylor coefficients at zero satisfy

$$\hat{f}(\alpha) = O(e^{-c|\alpha|^{d/(d+1)}}). \quad (0.3)$$

We prove that (0.3) does not characterize the common range of co-analytic Toeplitz operators in $H^2(B_d)$, $d \geq 2$:

Theorem 2.1 *Let $f(z_1, \dots, z_d) = f_1(z_1) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n z_1^n$, let $\varepsilon > 0$, and suppose that $a_n = O(e^{-cn^{\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon}})$ for some $c > 0$. Then f is in the range of the Toeplitz operator $T_m^{H^2(B_d)}$ for every non-zero m in $H^\infty(B_d)$.*

It follows, therefore, that for $d \geq 2$, the functional induced by $f(z_1, \dots, z_d) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} e^{-k^{\frac{4}{7}}} z_1^k$ is not bounded on some $P^2(w\sigma_d)$. In the proof of Theorem 3.4 we construct such a w that is continuous and vanishes at only one point.

1 Preliminary Lemmata

We need to know explicitly the projection from $L^2(B_d)$ onto $H^2(B_d)$. Let $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d)$ be a multi-index and $\zeta = (z_1, \dots, z_d)$ a point in $\mathbb{C}^d$. The function ζ^α then maps ζ to $z_1^{\alpha_1} \dots z_d^{\alpha_d}$. The notation $|\alpha|$ stands for $\alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_d$, and $\alpha! = \alpha_1! \dots \alpha_d!$.

Lemma 1.1

$$\int_{S_d} \zeta^\alpha \overline{\zeta^\beta} d\sigma_d = \delta_{\alpha,\beta} \frac{(d-1)! \alpha!}{(d-1+|\alpha|)!}. \quad (1.2)$$

Moreover, if $P_{H^2(B_d)}$ denotes the projection from $L^2(\sigma_d)$ onto $H^2(B_d)$, then

$$P_{H^2(B_d)} |z_2^{\alpha_2}|^2 \dots |z_d^{\alpha_d}|^2 \overline{z_1^j} z_1^i = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i < j \\ \frac{(d-1+i-j)! i! \alpha_2! \dots \alpha_d!}{(i-j)! (d-1+i+\alpha_2+\dots+\alpha_d)!} z_1^{i-j} & \text{if } i \geq j. \end{cases} \quad (1.3)$$

PROOF: Formula (1.2) is proved in [7]. The expression on the left-hand side of (1.3) is orthogonal to every monomial except z_1^{i-j} ; taking inner products gives the constant. $\square$

We wish to be able to transfer information about co-analytic Toeplitz operators with the same symbol on different spaces. To do this we use the following lemma, whose proof is immediate:

Lemma 1.4 *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a Hilbert space of holomorphic functions on B_d in which the monomials are mutually orthogonal. Let $m(z_1, \dots, z_d) = \sum_{\beta \in \mathbb{N}^d} b_\beta \zeta^\beta$. Then*

$$T_m^{\mathcal{H}} \frac{\zeta^\alpha}{\|\zeta^\alpha\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2} = \sum_{\beta \leq \alpha} \bar{b}_{\alpha-\beta} \frac{\zeta^\beta}{\|\zeta^\beta\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2} \quad (1.5)$$

This lemma also allows us to define Toeplitz operators with an unbounded conjugate analytic symbol. The formal definition (1.5) defines an upper triangular operator, with respect to the orthonormal basis of normalized monomials. It therefore has a domain which contains all the polynomials; we extend its domain to include all functions on which T_m , thought of as a formal operator on the power series, converges in each entry to the Taylor coefficients of some function in $\mathcal{H}$.

Let A^{-n} consist of all holomorphic functions m in the unit disk, satisfying $|m(z)| = O((1 - |z|)^{-n})$. The space A^0 is $H^\infty(B_1)$. For $n = 0$, the following result is proved in [1].

Lemma 1.6 *Let f be in A^{-n} for some n , and $0 < \alpha < 2$. Then*

$$\int_{B_1} (\log^- |f|)^\alpha dA < \infty.$$

PROOF: We can assume that f has no zeroes in $\{z : |z| < \frac{1}{2}\}$. It follows from [1] and standard Nevanlinna theory that for any function g in the Nevanlinna class $N(B_1)$, with $g(0) \neq 0$, and any $a < 2$,

$$\int_{B_1} (\log^- |g|)^a dA \leq K(T(g, 1), |g(0)|, a).$$

Fix p strictly between 1 and $\frac{2}{\alpha}$, let $a = \alpha p < 2$, let $q = \frac{p}{p-1}$ and let $N > q$. Let D_1 be a smoothly bounded convex domain inside the disk, containing $\{z : |z| < \frac{1}{2}\}$, whose closure touches the unit circle only at 1, and which has a high degree of tangency at 1: let the boundary of D_1 be $\{\rho(\theta)e^{i\theta} : -\pi \leq \theta \leq \pi\}$, and assume $1 - \rho(\theta) \sim |\theta|^N$. For any other point $\zeta = e^{i\theta_0}$ on the boundary of the unit disk, let $D_\zeta = e^{i\theta_0} D_1$.

Let ψ_ζ be the Riemann map of D_ζ onto B_1 that takes 0 to 0 and ζ to ζ . As the boundary of D_ζ is smooth, it follows from the Kellog-Warschawski theorem (see e.g. [5]) that ψ_ζ and its derivatives extend continuously to the closure of D_ζ , so distances before and after the conformal mapping are comparable.

If $r < \frac{1}{N}$, then f is in $H^r(D_\zeta)$, and $\sup_{\zeta \in S_1} \|f \circ \psi_\zeta^{-1}\|_{H^r} < \infty$. Thus

$$\int_{D_{e^{i\theta}}} (\log^- |f|)^a dA \leq C, \quad \text{for all } e^{i\theta}.$$

Integrating with respect to θ and changing the order of integration yields

$$\int_{B_1} (\log^- |f(re^{i\phi})|)^a (1-r)^{\frac{1}{N}} r dr d\phi < \infty.$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_1} (\log^- |f|)^a dA &\leq \left[\int_{B_1} (\log^- |f|)^{ap} (1-r)^{\frac{p}{N}} dA \right]^{\frac{1}{p}} \left[\int_{B_1} (1-r)^{-\frac{q}{N}} dA \right]^{\frac{1}{q}} \\ &< \infty. \end{aligned}$$

□

Let μ_n be the measure on the unit disk given by $d\mu_n(z) = \frac{1}{\pi}(1-|z|^2)^n d\text{Area}(z)$, and let $\mathcal{H}_n$ be $P^2(\mu_n)$. It is routine to verify that in $\mathcal{H}_n$ the monomials are mutually orthogonal, and

$$\|z^k\|_{\mathcal{H}_n}^2 = \frac{1}{(k+1) \dots (k+n+1)}.$$

The space $\mathcal{H}_0$ is the usual Bergman space for the disk. The following lemma is proved in [1] for $n = 0$; for $n > 0$, basically the same proof works (given Lemma 1.6), though some care must be taken as $T_{\bar{m}}$ is no longer bounded. We include a proof for completeness.

Lemma 1.7 *Let $n \geq 0$, and m be a function in A^{-n} , not identically zero. Suppose $f(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k z^k$ where $a_k = O(e^{-ck^{\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon}})$ for some ε and c greater than 0. Then for any $s \geq 2n$ there exists g in $\mathcal{H}_s$ such that $T_{\bar{m}}^{\mathcal{H}_s} g = f$.*

PROOF: First, observe that $f = T_{\bar{m}}^{\mathcal{H}_s} g$ for some g if and only if there is a constant C such that for all polynomials p

$$|\langle p, f \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_s}| \leq C \sqrt{\int |p|^2 |m|^2 d\mu_s}.$$

So it is sufficient to prove that

$$\left| \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \bar{a}_k \hat{p}(k) \frac{1}{(k+1) \dots (k+s+1)} \right| \leq C \sqrt{\int |p|^2 |m|^2 d\mu_s}.$$

This in turn will follow from the Banach-Steinhaus theorem if we can show that for any function h in $P^2(|m|^2 \mu_s)$,

$$\hat{h}(k) = O(e^{ck^{\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon}}). \quad (1.8)$$

Now Stoll showed in [9] that if h satisfies

$$\int_{B_1} (\log^+ |h|)^\alpha dArea < \infty$$

for some $\alpha > 0$ then $\hat{h}(k) = O(e^{o(\frac{2}{2+\alpha})})$. We can assume ε is small, and take $\alpha = \frac{2-4\varepsilon}{1+2\varepsilon}$. As h is in $P^2(|m|^2\mu_s)$, $h(z)m(z)(1-|z|^2)^{s/2}k(z)$ is in $L^2(dArea)$, and

$$\log^+ |h| \leq \log^+ |k| + \log^- |(1-|z|^2)^{s/2}| + \log^- |m|.$$

The first two terms on the right are clearly integrable to the α^{th} power, and so is the third by Lemma 1.6; therefore h satisfies (1.8) as desired. $\square$

We want to be able to restrict functions in the ball to planes and factor out zeros without losing control of the size of the function; the next lemma allows us to do this.

Lemma 1.9 *Let m be holomorphic on B_d and satisfy*

$$|m(z_1, \dots, z_d)| \leq C(1 - \sqrt{|z_1|^2 + \dots + |z_d|^2})^{-s}.$$

Suppose also that

$$m(z_1, \dots, z_d) = z_d^t m_2(z_1, \dots, z_d) + z_d^{t+1} m_3(z_1, \dots, z_d),$$

where m_2 and m_3 are analytic. Let $m_1(z_1, \dots, z_{d-1}) = m_2(z_1, \dots, z_{d-1}, 0)$. Then

$$|m_1(z_1, \dots, z_{d-1})| \leq (3d)^{s+t} C(1 - \sqrt{|z_1|^2 + \dots + |z_{d-1}|^2})^{-(s+t)}.$$

PROOF: Let $(z_1, \dots, z_{d-1})$ be in B_{d-1} , and let $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{3d}(1 - \sqrt{|z_1|^2 + \dots + |z_{d-1}|^2})$. Then the polydisk centered at $(z_1, \dots, z_{d-1}, 0)$ with multi-radius $(\varepsilon, \dots, \varepsilon)$ is contained in $(1 - \varepsilon)B_d$. Integrating on the distinguished boundary of the polydisk we get

$$\begin{aligned} |m_1(z_1, \dots, z_{d-1})| &= |m_2(z_1, \dots, z_{d-1}, 0)| \\ &= \left| \int_{(z_1, \dots, z_{d-1}, 0) + \varepsilon T^d} \frac{m(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_d)}{\zeta_3^t} \right| \\ &\leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon^{s+t}}. \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

2 Common Range of $T_{\bar{m}}$

We can now prove that a function that depends on only one variable is in the range of every $T_{\bar{m}}^{H^2(B_d)}$ if its Taylor coefficients decay like $e^{-ck^{\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon}}$.

Theorem 2.1 *Let $f(z_1, \dots, z_d) = f_1(z_1) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n z_1^n$, and suppose that $a_n = O(e^{-cn^{\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon}})$ for some $\varepsilon, c > 0$. Then f is in the range of the Toeplitz operator $T_{\bar{m}}^{H^2(B_d)}$ for every non-zero m in $H^\infty(B_d)$.*

PROOF: For $d = 1$, this is proved (without the ε) in [2], so assume $d \geq 2$. Fix m in $H^\infty(B_d)$;

$$m(z_1, \dots, z_d) = \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_d=0}^{\infty} b_{i_1, \dots, i_d} z_1^{i_1} \dots z_d^{i_d}.$$

Let

$$S = \{(i_2, \dots, i_d) : \text{for some } i_1, b_{i_1, \dots, i_d} \neq 0\}.$$

Define

$$t_d = \inf\{i_d : \text{for some } i_2, \dots, i_{d-1}, (i_2, \dots, i_{d-1}, i_d) \in S\},$$

and define t_k inductively by

$$t_k = \inf\{i_k : \text{for some } i_2, \dots, i_{k-1}, (i_2, \dots, i_{k-1}, i_k, t_{k+1}, \dots, t_d) \in S\}.$$

Let $n = t_2 + \dots + t_d$.

Case (a): $n = 0$.

Then the function

$$m_1(z_1) = m(z_1, 0, \dots, 0)$$

is not identically zero, and is in $H^\infty(B_1)$. By Lemma 1.1,

$$T_{\bar{m}}^{H^2(B_d)} z_1^i = \sum_j \bar{b}_{j, 0, \dots, 0} \frac{(i-j+1) \dots (i-j+d-1)}{(i+1) \dots (i+d-1)} z_1^{i-l}.$$

So by Lemma 1.4, if one can solve the equation

$$T_{\bar{m}_1}^{\mathcal{H}_{d-2}} g_1 = f_1 \tag{2.2}$$

for some g_1 in $\mathcal{H}_{d-2}$, then $g(z_1, \dots, z_d) = g_1(z_1)$ solves

$$T_{\bar{m}}^{H^2(B_d)} g = f,$$

and by Equation (1.2) $\|g\|_{H^2(B_d)} = \sqrt{(d-1)!} \|g_1\|_{\mathcal{H}_{d-1}} < \infty$. By Lemma 1.7, equation (2.2) has a solution.

Case (b): $n > 0$.

One can decompose m as

$$m(z_1, \dots, z_d) = z_2^{t_2} \dots z_d^{t_d} m_2(z_1, \dots, z_d) + m_3(z_1, \dots, z_d),$$

where each term in the expansion of m_3 is divisible by some $z_k^{t_k+1}$. Applying Lemma 1.9 inductively, $m_1(z) = m_2(z, 0, \dots, 0)$ is in A^{-n} , and by the choice of $t_2, \dots, t_d$, it is not identically zero. Consider the function

$$f_2(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k (k+d)(k+d+1) \dots (k+dn+1) z^k.$$

As $d \geq 2$, we can apply Lemma 1.7 with $s = dn$, so there is

$$g_2(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \gamma_k (k+1)(k+2) \dots (k+dn+1) z^k$$

in $\mathcal{H}_{dn}$ with

$$T_{\bar{m}_1}^{\mathcal{H}_{dn}} g_2 = f_2. \quad (2.3)$$

Define g by

$$g(z_1, \dots, z_d) = \frac{1}{t_2! \dots t_d!} z_2^{t_2} \dots z_d^{t_d} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \gamma_k (k+1)(k+2) \dots (k+n+d-1) z_1^k.$$

The function g is in $H^2(B_d)$ because

$$\begin{aligned} \|g\|_{H^2(B_d)}^2 &= \frac{(d-1)!}{t_2! \dots t_d!} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} |\gamma_k|^2 (k+1) \dots (k+n+d-1) \\ &\leq \frac{(d-1)!}{t_2! \dots t_d!} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} |\gamma_k|^2 (k+1) \dots (k+dn+1) \\ &= \frac{(d-1)!}{t_2! \dots t_d!} \|g_2\|_{\mathcal{H}_{(d-1)n}}^2 \\ &< \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover

$$T_{\bar{m}}^{H^2(B_d)} g = T_{\bar{z}_2^{t_2} \dots \bar{z}_d^{t_d} \bar{m}_1(z_1)}^{H^2(B_d)} g$$

is a function of z_1 only; it is, in fact, f . For if $T_{\bar{m}}^{H^2(B_d)} g = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} e_k z_1^k$, and $m_1(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} c_k z^k$, then taking the inner product with z_1^j we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{(d-1)!}{(j+1) \dots (j+d-1)} e_j &= \langle T_{\bar{m}}^{H^2(B_d)} g, z_1^j \rangle_{H^2(B_d)} \\ &= \langle g, z_2^{t_2} \dots z_d^{t_d} m_1 z_1^j \rangle_{H^2(B_d)} \\ &= (d-1)! \sum_{k=j}^{\infty} \gamma_k \bar{c}_{k-j} \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

Taking the inner product with z^j in Equation(2.3), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{(j+1)\dots(j+d-1)}a_j &= \langle T_{\bar{m}_1}^{\mathcal{H}_{dn}} g_2, z^j \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_{dn}} \\ &= \langle g_2, m_1 z^j \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_{dn}} \\ &= \sum_{k=j}^{\infty} \gamma_k \bar{c}_{k-j} \end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

Comparing Equations(2.4) and (2.5), we see that $T_{\bar{m}}^{H^2(B_d)} g = f$, as desired. $\square$

3 Proof of the main theorem

Define $F_{c,w}$ by

$$F_{c,w}(z) = \exp\left(c \frac{1 - |w|^2}{(1 - \langle z, w \rangle)^{d+1}}\right) \tag{3.1}$$

We need the following two results. The first states that $d(cF_{c,w}, 0) \rightarrow 0$, and was proved by Drewnowski. A proof is given in [4, Lemma 3.2].

Lemma 3.2 (Drewnowski)

$$\lim_{c \rightarrow 0} \sup_{w \in B_d} \int_{S_d} \log(1 + |cF_{c,w}|) d\sigma_d = 0.$$

The second result, due to Nawrocki, estimates the growth of the Taylor coefficients of $F_{c,w}$. We are interested in $w = re_1 = (r, 0, \dots, 0)$; in this case all the Taylor coefficients of F_{c,re_1} are positive, and the following follows easily from the proof of [4, Lemma 3.3]:

Lemma 3.3 (Nawrocki) *For each $c > 0$ there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that*

$$\inf_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{0 < r < 1} \sqrt{\frac{(d-1+i)!}{(d-1)! i!}} \hat{F}_{c,re_1}(i, 0, \dots, 0) e^{-\varepsilon i^{\frac{d}{d+1}}} > 0.$$

We can now prove the main theorem.

Theorem 3.4 *Let $d \geq 2$. There is a continuous non-negative function g on S_d , vanishing only at the point e_1 , and satisfying $\int_{S_d} \log(g) d\sigma_d > -\infty$, with the property that the only function m in $H^\infty(B_d)$ with $|m^*| \leq g$ almost everywhere $[\sigma_d]$ is the zero function.*

PROOF: Let $V_n = \{\zeta \in S_d : |\zeta - e_1| \geq \frac{1}{n}\}$. By Lemma 3.3, for any sequence c_n tending to zero, one can choose i_n and r_n such that

$$\hat{F}_{c_n, r_n e_1}(i_n, 0, \dots, 0) > \frac{n}{c_n} e^{(i_n)^{\frac{d}{d+1}}} \tag{3.5}$$

(because $\frac{4}{7} < \frac{d}{d+1}$). Moreover, by passing to a subsequence, one can assume that

$$\sup_{\zeta \in V_n} c_n |F_{c_n, r_n e_1}(\zeta)| \leq \frac{1}{2^n}, \quad (3.6)$$

and that

$$\int_{S_d} \log(1 + |c_n F_{c_n, r_n e_1}|) d\sigma_d \leq \frac{1}{2^n}.$$

Define g by

$$g(\zeta) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{1 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |c_n F_{c_n, r_n e_1}(\zeta)|^2}}.$$

It follows from (3.6) that g is continuous and vanishes only at e_1 . Moreover

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{S_d} \log g d\sigma_d &= -\frac{1}{2} \int_{S_d} \log(1 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |c_n F_{c_n, r_n e_1}|^2) d\sigma_d \\ &> -\int_{S_d} \log \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} (1 + |c_n F_{c_n, r_n e_1}|^2) d\sigma_d \\ &= -2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int_{S_d} \log(1 + |c_n F_{c_n, r_n e_1}|) d\sigma_d \\ &\geq -2. \end{aligned}$$

Now suppose there is a non-zero m in $H^\infty(B_d)$ with $|m^*| \leq g$ a.e. Then each of the functions $c_n F_{c_n, r_n e_1}$, being analytic in the ball of radius $\frac{1}{r_n}$, is in $P^2(|m^*|^2 \sigma)$; moreover they are all of norm less than one in this space, because

$$\int_{S_d} |c_n F_{c_n, r_n e_1}|^2 |m^*|^2 d\sigma \leq \int_{S_d} |c_n F_{c_n, r_n e_1}|^2 g^2 d\sigma < 1.$$

Let

$$f(z_1, \dots, z_d) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} e^{-k^{\frac{4}{7}}} \frac{(k+d-1)!}{(d-1)!k!} z_1^k.$$

By Theorem 2.1, there is a function h in $H^2(B_d)$ with

$$T_m^{H^2(B_d)} h = f.$$

It follows that the linear map

$$\Gamma : p \mapsto \langle p, f \rangle_{H^2(B_d)},$$

defined a priori on the polynomials, extends by continuity to a bounded linear map on $P^2(|m^*|^2 \sigma)$, as

$$|\Gamma(p)| = |\langle p, P(\bar{m}h) \rangle| = \left| \int p m^* \bar{h}^* d\sigma_d \right| \leq \|h\|_{H^2(B_d)} \|p\|_{P^2(|m^*|^2 \sigma)}.$$

Moreover, each function $c_n F_{c_n, r_n e_1}$ is uniformly approximated on S_d by the partial sums of its Taylor series; hence

$$\Gamma(c_n F_{c_n, r_n e_1}) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} c_n \hat{F}_{c_n, r_n e_1}(k) e^{-k^{\frac{4}{7}}}. \quad (3.7)$$

But all the terms on the right-hand side of (3.7) are positive, and the i_n^{th} term is at least n by Equation (3.5). This contradicts the boundedness of Γ . $\square$

We note that the theorem is much easier to prove if g is not required to be continuous. One shows, as in the one-variable case, that

$$N^+(B_d) = \cup P^2(w\sigma_d)$$

where w ranges over all log-integrable weights. This is a strictly larger set than

$$\cup_{m \in H^\infty(B_d)} P^2(|m^\star|^2 \sigma_d)$$

because if f is in some $P^2(|m^\star|^2 \sigma_d)$, then fm is in $H^2(B_d)$, so the zero-set of f is contained in an $H^2(B_d)$ -zero set; but it is a result of Rudin that for any $p < 2$, there is a function in $H^p(B_d)$ whose zero set is not contained in any $H^2(B_d)$ -zero set [6]. It follows that such a function is in $P^2(w^2 \sigma_d)$ for some log-integrable w , but not in any $P^2(|m^\star|^2 \sigma_d)$, so w cannot dominate the modulus of any $m^\star$.

References

- [1] J.E. McCarthy. Coefficient estimates in weighted Bergman spaces. to appear.
- [2] J.E. McCarthy. Common range of co-analytic Toeplitz operators. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 3(4):793–799, 1990.
- [3] J.E. McCarthy. Topologies on the Smirnov class. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 104(1):229–241, 1992.
- [4] M. Nawrocki. Linear functionals on the Smirnov class of the unit ball in C^n . *Annales Acad. Sci. Fenn.*, 14:369–379, 1989.
- [5] C. Pommerenke. *Boundary behaviour of conformal maps*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1992.
- [6] W. Rudin. Zeros of holomorphic functions in balls. *Indag. Math.*, 38:57–65, 1976.

- [7] W. Rudin. *Function Theory in the unit ball of C^n* . Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1980.
- [8] W. Rudin. *New constructions of functions holomorphic in the unit ball of C^n* . C.B.M.S. No. 63. American Mathematical Society, Providence, 1986.
- [9] M. Stoll. Mean growth and Taylor coefficients of some topological algebras of analytic functions. *Ann. Polon. Math.*, XXXV:139–158, 1977.
- [10] G. Szegő. Über die Randwerten einer analytischen Funktionen. *Math. Ann.*, 84:232–244, 1921.
- [11] N. Yanagihara. Multipliers and linear functionals for the class N^+ . *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 180:449–461, 1973.